



**MAYOR
JERRY SANDERS
Science and Technology Commission
MEETING MINUTES**

The San Diego Science and Technology Commission (SDS&TC) held a Regularly Scheduled Meeting on February 8, 2006 hosted by Community and Economic Development located at 600B Street, San Diego, CA 92101.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:** Dr. Martha Dennis, SDS&TC Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M. Members present: Luis Avila, Dr. Hui Cai, Daniel Chang, Jon Cohen, Dr. Martha Dennis, Charles Holland, Kristopher Lichter, Tyler Orion, and Maurice Wilson. Members absent: Craig Andrews, Scott Corlett, Dr. Tom Dillon, Susan Myrland, Dr. Gail Naughton, Marc Nemer, Craig Roberts, Carrie Stone, and Julie Meier Wright. Community & Economic Development Department staff members: Toni Dillon, Russ Gibbon, and Tina Hines. City of San Diego Water Department staff members: Ron Coss, Maryam Liaghat, Enrique Salvatierra, and Marsi Steiner. Members of the public present: Marney Cox with SANDAG, Jane Signalgo-Cox with the San Diego Regional EDC, and Gordon Carrier of Carrier Johnson Architects.
- II. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.
- III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR:** December 7, 2005 (MOTION/Litcher/Orion/UNANIMOUS)
- IV. **CO-LOCATION- INDUSTRIAL/RESIDENTIAL**

A. Presentation: CO-LOCATION: Presenter: Mr. Marney Cox, Chief Economist, with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Mr. Cox defined co-location as the concept of locating residential development next to employment sites. He identified the following factors as effecting co-location: 1) Smart Growth Strategies; 2) shortage of housing units; 3) soaring home prices in San Diego; 4) market price per square feet for industrial versus residential land.

Mr. Cox stated that a strategic approach to co-location reviews the “compatibility risk factors” such as: 1) air emissions; 2) hazardous materials; 3) lighting; 4) hours of operation; 5) noise level; 6) truck traffic. He noted that only ten percent (10%) of companies have “compatibility risk factors” as compared with ninety percent (90%) of companies that would require limited mitigation. He opined that in industrial zoned areas where the industrial use remains the predominate use; the area should be considered prime industrial land. In contrast, in areas where non-industrial uses such as residential uses have eroded the industrial base zone, the city should consider rezoning these areas to encourage co-location.

Mr. Cox concluded his presentation with a proposed framework for finding resolutions for the co-location of residential and industrial uses: 1) formulate public policy guidelines to prevent and encourage co-location in appropriate areas; 2) identify prime industrial districts; 3) develop co-location compatibility criteria; 4) apply criteria to the prime industrial districts; 5) incorporate these new guidelines into the Economic Prosperity Element of the City’s General Plan.

B. Presentation: The Co-Location Dilemma: Presenter: Mr. Gordon Carrier, Chief Executive Officer, Carrier Johnson Architecture. Mr. Gordon stated that fundamentally the notion of Smart Growth is just a phrase until people start living in walking distance to employment sites. He suggested that the city of San Diego citizens will never be able to resolve air quality or traffic congestion issues, particularly without a mass transit system commensurate to other cities.

Mr. Carrier opined that the key to the discussion of co-location is the simple definition of compatibility. He stated that the current definition of compatibility will evolve in time due to market driven forces. Due to a shortage of available land in the right places, the physical form of industries will change. He stated that the market will dictate that the construction of multi-story industrial buildings will replace one story models to accommodate more density.

Mr. Carrier concluded his presentation with the recommendation of a model that could be used for co-location. This model would require a minimum of 300 acres of contiguous industrial land. A maximum of ten percent of this land would be used for residential development. In addition, he opined that residential housing units would be constructed in a fixed central position within the industrial zone. Potential residential developers would be required to build a maximum density of 70 units per acre. These residential units would be built on a transit corridor.

V. CITY OF SAN DIEGO WATER REUSE STUDY

A. Presentation: City of San Diego Water Reuse Study: Mr. Coss stated that in January of 2004, City Council authorized a study by the water Department to evaluate opportunities to increase recycled water usage in the City. Reuse study options requested by City Council included: 1) expansion of the recycled water distribution system; 2) creation of surface storage reservoirs; 3) live stream discharge/wetlands creation; 4) recharge of groundwater basins; 5) reservoir augmentation; 6) gray water use.

The objective of this Study was to be impartial, balanced, comprehensive science-based study of all recycle water opportunities to meet current and future water supply needs. This Study evaluated several options to maximize the use of recycled water that can be produced by the City's two water reclamation plants. Some options involve familiar uses of recycled water such as landscape irrigation, construction, and industrial processing. Other options involve using advanced water treatment technology to produce highly treated recycled water. This technology allows recycled water to be added to groundwater storage basins and water storage reservoirs so that it can help supplement other sources of drinking water.

Mr. Coss stated that Water Department used an Independent Advisory Panel selected by the National Water Research Institute to conduct this "reuse" Study. The consensus of this Panel was that it is the Water Department responsibly addressed the following key technical issues in the Study: 1) pre-treatment; 2) toxicity and health; 3) regulations; 4) public outreach.

As much discussion resulted from the Water Department's presentation, there was not enough time remaining to discuss this Department's request for the Commission to consider a letter of support for this Study. It was suggested the topic be tabled for considered at the next meeting.

- VI. SUB-COMMITTEE UPDATE: Due to the constraint of time, DIWG and the Public WiFi Working Group updates were post phoned.
- VII. UPCOMING MEETINGS: The next meeting scheduled will be held Wednesday, April 19, 2006.
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business of the Commission, this meeting was adjourned at 5:00 P.M.